

REMARKS

Administrative Overview

In the Office Action mailed on December 27, 2007, claims 13–15 and 19–21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0211251 to Lee et al. (hereinafter “Lee”). Claim 18 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants hereby amend independent claims 1 and 13, and hereby cancel claim 18. In particular, the Applicants have amended each of the independent claims 1 and 13 to include all of the limitations of now cancelled dependent claim 18. No new matter is introduced by these claim amendments. After entry of these amendments, claims 1–16 and 19–21 will be pending in this application, with claims 1–12 withdrawn.

The Applicants note that the Examiner originally required a restriction between product and process claims. Accordingly, as the process claims (*i.e.*, withdrawn claims 1–12) have been amended to include all the limitations of amended independent product claim 13, the Applicants respectfully request that claims 1–12 be rejoined, in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04(b), if amended independent product claim 13 is found to be allowable.

The Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of claims 13–16 and 19–21 in light of the amendments made above and the arguments presented below, and the withdrawal of all rejections and objections.

The Examiner’s rejections are addressed in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Amended Claims 13–16 and 19–21 are Patentable over Lee

Claims 13–15 and 19–21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to the claims, as amended.

Applicants have amended independent claim 13 to include all of the limitations of now cancelled dependent claim 18, which the Applicants appreciatively note was indicated by the Examiner to recite allowable subject matter. See, Office Action at Pages 3–4. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 13 and claims 14–16 and 19–21, which depend directly therefrom, are patentable over Lee.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that this ground of rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13–16 and 19–21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection and objection, and the passage of claims 13–16 and 19–21 to allowance in due course. In addition, the Applicants respectfully request that claims 1–12 be rejoined, in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04(b), and that those claims also be allowed in due course.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 16, 2008
Registration No. 60,571

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1973
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231

/Kenneth E. Radcliffe/
Kenneth E. Radcliffe, Esq.
Attorney for the Applicants
Goodwin | Procter LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

LIBA/1857830.1